Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/747,645	MARCUS, FRANCINEKAY
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Monica S. Carter	3722
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>Final Rejection</u>		
(1) Monica S. Carter.	(3)	
(2) FrancineKay Marcus.	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>14 June 2005</u>	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: N/A		
Claims discussed: N/A		
Prior art documents discussed: N/A		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENI See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
Monica S. Carta	0-00 tr.	
MONICAS. CARTER PRIMARY EXAMINER		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Application	nt/Applicant's Representative Si	ignature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner telephoned Ms. Marcus to inquire whether or not a response the Office action mailed January 13, 2005 was filed. Ms. Marcus stated that she was being represented by an attorney and that the attorney would be handling her application. The examiner informed Ms. Marcus that a Revocation/Power of Attorney appointing an attorney was not of record and that she continues to have Power of Attorney of her application. The examiner stated to Ms. Marcus that she should contact her attorney to find out if the necessary Revocation/Power of Attorney and response to the Office action mailed January 13, 2005 was timely filed. As of today, June 15, 2005, the examiner has not heard from Ms. Marcus nor her attorney. The six-month statutory response period has expired and, therefore, the application is abandoned..